arXiv:1701.00585v1 [math.CO] 3 Jan 2017

A strengthened inequality of Alon-Babai-Suzuki's conjecture on set systems with restricted intersections modulo p

Wang Xin[a], Hengjia Wei[b] and Gennian Ge[b,c,*]

[a] School of Mathematical Sciences, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou 310027, Zhejiang, China

[b] School of Mathematical Sciences, Capital Normal University, Beijing, 100048, China

[c] Beijing Center for Mathematics and Information Interdisciplinary Sciences, Beijing, 100048, China

Abstract

Let $K = \{k_1, k_2, \ldots, k_r\}$ and $L = \{l_1, l_2, \ldots, l_s\}$ be disjoint subsets of $\{0, 1, \ldots, p-1\}$, where p is a prime and $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_m\}$ be a family of subsets of $[n]$ such that $|A_i| \pmod p \in K$ for all $A_i \in \mathcal{A}$ and $|A_i \cap A_j| \pmod p \in L$ for $i \neq j$. In 1991, Alon, Babai and Suzuki conjectured that if $n \geq s + \max_{1\leq i\leq r} k_i$, then $|\mathcal{A}| \leq \binom{n}{s} + \binom{n}{s-1} + \cdots + \binom{n}{s-r+1}$. In 2000, Qian and Ray-Chaudhuri proved the conjecture under the condition $n \geq 2s - r$. In 2015, Hwang and Kim verified the conjecture of Alon, Babai and Suzuki.

In this paper, we will prove that if $n \geq 2s - 2r + 1$ or $n \geq s + \max_{1\leq i\leq r} k_i$, then

$$|\mathcal{A}| \leq \binom{n-1}{s} + \binom{n-1}{s-1} + \cdots + \binom{n-1}{s-2r+1}.$$

This result strengthens the upper bound of Alon, Babai and Suzuki's conjecture when $n \geq 2s - 2$.

1 Introduction

A family $\mathcal{A}$ of subsets of $[n]$ is called *intersecting* if every pair of distinct subsets $A_i, A_j \in \mathcal{A}$ have a nonempty intersection. Let L be a set of s nonnegative integers. A family $\mathcal{A}$ of subsets of $[n] = \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ is *L-intersecting* if $|A_i \cap A_j| \in L$ for every pair of distinct subsets $A_i, A_j \in \mathcal{A}$. A family $\mathcal{A}$ is *k-uniform* if it is a collection of k-subsets of $[n]$. Thus, a k-uniform intersecting family is L-intersecting for $L = \{1, 2, \ldots, k-1\}$.

The following is an intersection theorem of de Bruijin and Erdös [4].

Theorem 1.1 (de Bruijin and Erdös, 1948 [4]). *If $\mathcal{A}$ is a family of subsets of $[n]$ satisfying $|A_i \cap A_i| = 1$ for every pair of distinct subsets $A_i, A_j \in \mathcal{A}$, then $|\mathcal{A}| \leq n$.*

A year later, Bose [2] obtained the following more general intersection theorem which requires the intersections to have exactly λ elements.

Theorem 1.2 (Bose, 1949 [2]). *If $\mathcal{A}$ is a family of subsets of $[n]$ satisfying $|A_i \cap A_i| = \lambda$ for every pair of distinct subsets $A_i, A_j \in \mathcal{A}$, then $|\mathcal{A}| \leq n$.*

*Corresponding author. Email address: 11235062@zju.edu.cn (X. Wang), ven0505@163.com (H. Wei), gnge@zju.edu.cn (G. Ge).

In 1961, Erdös, Ko and Rado [5] proved the following classical result on k-uniform intersecting families.

Theorem 1.3 (Erdös, Ko and Rado, 1961 [5]). *Let $n \geq 2k$ and let $\mathcal{A}$ be a k-uniform intersecting family of subsets of $[n]$. Then $|\mathcal{A}| \leq \binom{n-1}{k-1}$ with equality only when $\mathcal{A}$ consists of all k-subsets containing a common element.*

In 1975, Ray-Chaudhuri and Wilson [11] made a major progress by deriving the following upper bound for a k-uniform L-intersecting family.

Theorem 1.4 (Ray-Chaudhuri and Wilson, 1975 [11]). *If $\mathcal{A}$ is a k-uniform L-intersecting family of subsets of $[n]$, then $|\mathcal{A}| \leq \binom{n}{s}$.*

In terms of parameters n and s, this inequality is best possible, as shown by the set of all s-subsets of $[n]$ with $L = \{0, 1, \ldots, s-1\}$.

In 1981, Frankl and Wilson [6] obtained the following celebrated theorem which extends Theorem 1.4 by allowing different subset sizes.

Theorem 1.5 (Frankl and Wilson, 1981 [6]). *If $\mathcal{A}$ is an L-intersecting family of subsets of $[n]$, then $\mathcal{A} \leq \binom{n}{s} + \binom{n}{s-1} + \cdots + \binom{n}{0}$.*

The upper bound in Theorem 1.5 is best possible, as demonstrated by the set of all subsets of size at most s of $[n]$.

In the same paper, a modular version of Theorem 1.4 was also proved.

Theorem 1.6 (Frankl and Wilson, 1981 [6]). *If $\mathcal{A}$ is a k-uniform family of subsets of $[n]$ such that $k \pmod p \notin L$ and $|A_i \cap A_j| \pmod p \in L$ for all $i \neq j$, then $|\mathcal{A}| \leq \binom{n}{s}$.*

In 1991, Alon, Babai and Suzuki [1] proved the following theorem, which is a generalization of Theorem 1.6 by replacing the condition of uniformity with the condition that the members of $\mathcal{A}$ have r different sizes.

Theorem 1.7 (Alon, Babai and Suzuki, 1991 [1]). *Let $K = \{k_1, k_2, \ldots, k_r\}$ and $L = \{l_1, l_2, \ldots, l_s\}$ be two disjoint subsets of $\{0, 1, \ldots, p-1\}$, where p is a prime, and let $\mathcal{A}$ be a family of subsets of $[n]$ such that $|A_i| \pmod p \in K$ for all $A_i \in \mathcal{A}$ and $|A_i \cap A_j| \pmod p \in L$ for $i \neq j$. If $r(s-r+1) \leq p-1$ and $n \geq s + \max_{1 \leq i \leq r} k_i$, then $|\mathcal{A}| \leq \binom{n}{s} + \binom{n}{s-1} + \cdots + \binom{n}{s-r+1}$.*

In the proof of Theorem 1.7, Alon, Babai and Suzuki used a very elegant linear algebra method together with their Lemma 3.6 which needs the condition $r(s-r+1) \leq p-1$ and $n \geq s + \max_{1 \leq i \leq r} k_i$. They conjectured that the condition $r(s-r+1) \leq p-1$ in the statement of their theorem can be dropped off. However, their approach cannot work for this stronger claim. In an effort to prove the Alon-Babai-Suzuki's conjecture, Snevily [12] obtained the following result.

Theorem 1.8 (Snevily, 1994 [12]). *Let p be a prime and K, L be two disjoint subsets of $\{0, 1, \ldots, p-1\}$. Let $|L| = s$ and let $\mathcal{A}$ be a family of subsets of $[n]$ such that $|A_i| \pmod p \in K$ for all $A_i \in \mathcal{A}$ and $|A_i \cap A_j| \pmod p \in L$ for $i \neq j$. Then $|\mathcal{A}| \leq \binom{n-1}{s} + \binom{n-1}{s-1} + \cdots + \binom{n-1}{0}$.*

Since $\binom{n-1}{s} + \binom{n-1}{s-1} = \binom{n}{s}$ and $\binom{n}{s-1} > \sum_{i=0}^{s-2} \binom{n-1}{i}$ when n is sufficiently large, Theorem 1.8 not only confirms the conjecture of Alon, Babai and Suzuki in many cases but also strengthens the upper bound of their theorem when n is sufficiently large.

In 2000, Qian and Ray-Chaudhuri [10] developed a new linear algebra approach and proved the next theorem which shows that the same conclusion in Theorem 1.7 holds if the two conditions $r(s-r+1) \leq p-1$ and $n \geq s + \max_{1 \leq i \leq r} k_i$ are replaced by a single more relaxed condition $n \geq 2s - r$.

Theorem 1.9 (Qian and Ray-Chaudhuri, 2000 [10]). *Let p be a prime and let $L = \{l_1, l_2, \ldots, l_s\}$ and $K = \{k_1, k_2, \ldots, k_r\}$ be two disjoint subsets of $\{0, 1, \ldots, p-1\}$ such that $n \geq 2s - r$. Suppose that $\mathcal{A}$ is a family of subsets of $[n]$ such that $|A_i| \pmod p \in K$ for all $A_i \in \mathcal{A}$ and $|A_i \cap A_j| \pmod p \in L$ for every $i \neq j$. Then $|\mathcal{A}| \leq \binom{n}{s} + \binom{n}{s-1} + \cdots + \binom{n}{s-r+1}$.*

Recently, Hwang and Kim [8] verified the conjecture of Alon, Babai and Suzuki.

Theorem 1.10 (Hwang and Kim, 2015 [8]). *Let $K = \{k_1, k_2, \ldots, k_r\}$ and $L = \{l_1, l_2, \ldots . l_s\}$ be two disjoint subsets of $\{0, 1, \ldots, p-1\}$, where p is a prime, and let $\mathcal{A}$ be a family of subsets of $[n]$ such that $|A_i| \pmod p \in K$ for all $A_i \in \mathcal{A}$ and $|A_i \cap A_j| \pmod p \in L$ for $i \neq j$. If $n \geq s + \max_{1 \leq i \leq r} k_i$, then $|\mathcal{A}| \leq \binom{n}{s} + \binom{n}{s-1} + \cdots + \binom{n}{s-r+1}$.*

We note here that in some instances Alon, Babai and Suzuki's condition holds but Qian and Ray-Chaudhuri's condition does not, while in some other instances the later condition holds but the former condition does not.

In [3], Chen and Liu strengthened the upper bounds of Theorem 1.8 under the condition $\min\{k_i\} > \max\{l_i\}$.

Theorem 1.11 (Chen and Liu, 2009 [3]). *Let p be a prime and let $L = \{l_1, l_2, \ldots, l_s\}$ and $K = \{k_1, k_2, \ldots, k_r\}$ be two disjoint subsets of $\{0, 1, \ldots, p-1\}$ such that $\min\{k_i\} > \max\{l_i\}$. Suppose that $\mathcal{A}$ is a family of subsets of $[n]$ such that $|A_i| \pmod p \in K$ for all $A_i \in \mathcal{A}$ and $|A_i \cap A_j| \pmod p \in L$ for every $i \neq j$. Then $|\mathcal{A}| \leq \binom{n-1}{s} + \binom{n-1}{s-1} + \cdots + \binom{n-1}{s-2r+1}$.*

In [9], Liu and Yang generalized Theorem 1.11 under a relaxed condition $k_i > s - r$ for every i.

Theorem 1.12 (Liu and Yang, 2014 [3]). *Let p be a prime and let $L = \{l_1, l_2, \ldots, l_s\}$ and $K = \{k_1, k_2, \ldots, k_r\}$ be two disjoint subsets of $\{0, 1, \ldots, p-1\}$ such that $k_i > s - r$ for every i. Suppose that $\mathcal{A}$ is a family of subsets of $[n]$ such that $|A_i| \pmod p \in K$ for all $A_i \in \mathcal{A}$ and $|A_i \cap A_j| \pmod p \in L$ for every $i \neq j$. Then $|\mathcal{A}| \leq \binom{n-1}{s} + \binom{n-1}{s-1} + \cdots + \binom{n-1}{s-2r+1}$.*

In the same paper, they also obtained the same bound under the condition of Theorem 1.7.

Theorem 1.13 (Liu and Yang, 2014 [3]). *Let p be a prime and let $L = \{l_1, l_2, \ldots, l_s\}$ and $K = \{k_1, k_2, \ldots, k_r\}$ be two disjoint subsets of $\{0, 1, \ldots, p-1\}$ such that $r(s-r+1) \leq p-1$ and $n \geq s + \max_{1 \leq i \leq r} k_i$. Suppose that $\mathcal{A}$ is a family of subsets of $[n]$ such that $|A_i| \pmod p \in K$ for all $A_i \in \mathcal{A}$ and $|A_i \cap A_j| \pmod p \in L$ for every $i \neq j$. Then $|\mathcal{A}| \leq \binom{n-1}{s} + \binom{n-1}{s-1} + \cdots + \binom{n-1}{s-2r+1}$.*

In this paper, we show that Theorem 1.13 still holds under the Alon, Babai and Suzuki's condition; that is to say, we can drop the condition $r(s-r+1) \leq p-1$ in Theorem 1.13.

Theorem 1.14. *Let p be a prime and let $L = \{l_1, l_2, \ldots, l_s\}$ and $K = \{k_1, k_2, \ldots, k_r\}$ be two disjoint subsets of $\{0, 1, \ldots, p-1\}$. Suppose that $\mathcal{A}$ is a family of subsets of $[n]$ such that $|A_i| \pmod p \in K$ for all $A_i \in \mathcal{A}$ and $|A_i \cap A_j| \pmod p \in L$ for every $i \neq j$. If $n \geq s + \max_{1 \leq i \leq r} k_i$, then $|\mathcal{A}| \leq \binom{n-1}{s} + \binom{n-1}{s-1} + \cdots + \binom{n-1}{s-2r+1}$.*

Note that $\binom{n-1}{s} + \binom{n-1}{s-1} + \cdots + \binom{n-1}{s-2r+1} = \binom{n}{s} + \binom{n}{s-2} + \cdots + \binom{n}{s-2(r-1)}$ and $\binom{n}{s-2i} < \binom{n}{s-i}$ for $1 \leq i \leq r-1$ when $n \geq 2s-2$. Our result strengthens the upper bound of Alon-Babai-Suzuki's conjecture (Theorems 1.10) when $n \geq 2s-2$.

In the proof of Theorem 1.14, we first prove that the bound holds under the condition $n \geq 2s - 2r + 1$, which relaxes the condition $n \geq 2s - r$ in the theorem of Qian and Ray-Chaudhuri.

Theorem 1.15. *Let p be a prime and let $L = \{l_1, l_2, \ldots, l_s\}$ and $K = \{k_1, k_2, \ldots, k_r\}$ be two disjoint subsets of $\{0, 1, \ldots, p-1\}$. Suppose that $\mathcal{A}$ is a family of subsets of $[n]$ such that $|A_i| \pmod p \in K$ for all $A_i \in \mathcal{A}$ and $|A_i \cap A_j| \pmod p \in L$ for every $i \neq j$. If $n \geq 2s - 2r + 1$, then $|\mathcal{A}| \leq \binom{n-1}{s} + \binom{n-1}{s-1} + \cdots + \binom{n-1}{s-2r+1}$.*

Theorems 1.7, 1.9, 1.12 and 1.13 have been extended to k-wise L-intersecting families in [7, 9]. With a similar idea, our results can also be extended to the k-wise case.

2 Proof of Theorem 1.15

In this section we prove Theorem 1.15, which will be helpful in the proof of Theorem 1.14.

Throughout this section, let $X = [n-1] = \{1, 2, \ldots, n-1\}$ be an $(n-1)$-element set, p be a prime, and let $L = \{l_1, l_2, \ldots, l_s\}$ and $K = \{k_1, k_2, \ldots, k_r\}$ be two disjoint subsets of $\{0, 1, \ldots, p-1\}$. Suppose that $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_m\}$ is a family of subsets of $[n]$ such that (1) $|A_i| \pmod p \in K$ for every $1 \leq i \leq m$, (2) $|A_i \cap A_j| \pmod p \in L$ for $i \neq j$. Without loss of generality, assume that there exists a positive integer t such that $n \notin A_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq t$ and $n \in A_i$ for $i \geq t+1$. Denote

$$\mathbb{P}_i(X) = \{S | S \subset X \text{ and } |S| = i\}.$$

We associate a variable x_i for each $A_i \in \mathcal{A}$ and set $x = (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_m)$. For each $I \subset X$, define

$$L_I = \sum_{i: I \subset A_i \in \mathcal{A}} x_i.$$

Consider the system of linear equation over the field $\mathbb{F}_p$:

$$\{L_I = 0, \quad \text{where } I \text{ runs through } \cup_{i=0}^{s} \mathbb{P}_i(X)\}. \tag{1}$$

Proposition 2.1. *Assume that $L \cap K = \emptyset$. If $\mathcal{A}$ is a mod p L-intersecting family with $|A_i| \pmod p \in K$ for every i, then the only solution of the above system of linear equations is the trivial solution.*

Proof. Let $v = (v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_m)$ be a solution to the system (1). We will show that v is the zero solution over the field $\mathbb{F}_p$. Define

$$g(x) = \prod_{j=1}^{s} (x - l_j),$$

and

$$h(x) = g(x+1) = \prod_{j=1}^{s} (x + 1 - l_j).$$

Since $\binom{x}{0}, \binom{x}{1}, \ldots, \binom{x}{s}$ form a basis for the vector space spanned by all the polynomials in $\mathbb{F}_p[x]$ of degree at most s, there exist $a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_s \in \mathbb{F}_p$ and $b_0, b_1, \ldots, b_s \in \mathbb{F}_p$ such that

$$g(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{s} a_i \binom{x}{i},$$

and

$$h(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{s} b_i \binom{x}{i}.$$

Let A_{i_0} be an element in $\mathcal{A}$ with $v_{i_0} \neq 0$. Next we prove the following identities:

If $n \notin A_{i_0}$, then

$$\sum_{i=0}^{s} a_i \sum_{I \in \mathbb{P}_i(X), I \subset A_{i_0}} L_I = \sum_{A_i \in \mathcal{A}} g(|A_i \cap A_{i_0}|) x_i; \tag{2}$$

if $n \in A_{i_0}$, then

$$\sum_{i=0}^{s} b_i \sum_{I \in \mathbb{P}_i(X), I \subset A_{i_0}} L_I = \sum_{i=1}^{t} h(|A_i \cap A_{i_0}|) x_i + \sum_{i \geq t+1} h(|A_i \cap A_{i_0}| - 1) x_i. \tag{3}$$

We prove them by comparing the coefficients of both sides. For any $A_i \in \mathcal{A}$, the coefficient of x_i in the left hand side of (2) is

$$\sum_{i=0}^{s} a_i |\{I \in \mathbb{P}_i(X) : I \subset A_{i_0}, I \subset A_i\}| = \sum_{i=0}^{s} a_i \binom{|A_i \cap A_{i_0}|}{i},$$

which is equal to $g(|A_i \cap A_{i_0}|)$ by the definition of a_i. This proves the identity (2).

For any $i \leq t$, the coefficient of x_i in the left hand side of (3) is

$$\sum_{i=0}^{s} b_i |\{I \in \mathbb{P}_i(X) : I \subset A_{i_0}, I \subset A_i\}| = \sum_{i=0}^{s} b_i \binom{|A_i \cap A_{i_0}|}{i},$$

for any $i \geq t+1$, the coefficient of x_i in the left hand side of (3) is

$$\sum_{i=0}^{s} b_i |\{I \in \mathbb{P}_i(X) : I \subset A_{i_0}, I \subset A_i\}| = \sum_{i=0}^{s} b_i \binom{|A_i \cap A_{i_0}| - 1}{i}.$$

This proves the identity (3).

If $n \notin A_{i_0}$, substituting x_i with v_i for all i in the identity (2), we have

$$\sum_{i=0}^{s} a_i \sum_{I \in \mathbb{P}_i(X), I \subset A_{i_0}} L_I(v) = \sum_{A_i \in \mathcal{A}} g(|A_i \cap A_{i_0}|) v_i.$$

It is clear that the left hand side is 0 since v is a solution to (1). For $A_i \in \mathcal{A}$ with $i \neq i_0$, $|A_i \cap A_{i_0}| \pmod p \in L$ and so $g(|A_i \cap A_{i_0}|) = 0$. Thus the right hand side of the above identity is equal to $g(|A_{i_0}|)v_{i_0}$. So $g(|A_{i_0}|)v_{i_0} = 0$. Since $L \cap K = \emptyset$, we have $g(|A_{i_0}|) \neq 0$ and so $v_{i_0} = 0$. This is a contradiction to the definition of v.

If $n \in A_{i_0}$, substituting x_i with v_i for all i in the identity (3), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=0}^{s} b_i \sum_{I \in \mathbb{P}_i(X), I \subset A_{i_0}} L_I(v) &= \sum_{i=1}^{t} h(|A_i \cap A_{i_0}|) v_i + \sum_{i \geq t+1} h(|A_i \cap A_{i_0}| - 1) v_i \\ &= \sum_{i \geq t+1} h(|A_i \cap A_{i_0}| - 1) v_i \quad \text{since } v_i = 0 \text{ for all } i \leq t.\end{aligned}$$

Since $h(|A_i \cap A_{i_0}| - 1) = g(|A_i \cap A_{i_0}|)$, with a similar argument to the above case, we can deduce the same contradiction. Then the proposition follows. □

As a result of this proposition, we have:

$$|\mathcal{A}| \leq \dim(\{L_I : I \in \cup_{i=0}^{s} \mathbb{P}_i(X)\}),$$

where $\dim(\{L_I : I \in \cup_{i=0}^{s} \mathbb{P}_i(X)\})$ is defined to be the dimension of the space spanned by $\{L_I : I \in \cup_{i=0}^{s} \mathbb{P}_i(X)\}$. In the remaining of this section, we make efforts to give an upper bound on this dimension.

Lemma 2.2. *For any $i \in \{0, 1, \ldots, s-2r+1\}$ and every $I \in \mathbb{P}_i(X)$, the linear form*

$$\sum_{H \in \mathbb{P}_{i+2r}(X), I \subset H} L_H$$

is linearly dependent on the set of linear forms $\{L_H : i \leq |H| \leq i+2r-1, H \subset X\}$ over $\mathbb{F}_p$.

Proof. Define

$$f(x) = \left(\prod_{j=1}^{r}(x-(k_j-i))\right) \times \left(\prod_{j=1}^{r}(x-(k_j-1-i))\right).$$

We distinguish two cases.

(a) $i \pmod p \notin K$ and $i+1 \pmod p \notin K$ for all i. In this case $\forall\ k_j \in K$, $k_j - i \neq 0$ and $k_j - i - 1 \neq 0$ in $\mathbb{F}_p$ and so $c = (k_1-i)(k_2-i)\cdots(k_r-i)(k_1-i-1)\cdots(k_r-i-1) \neq 0$ in $\mathbb{F}_p$. It is clear that there exist $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_{2r-1} \in \mathbb{F}_p$, $a_{2r} = (2r)! \in \mathbb{F}_p - \{0\}$ such that

$$a_1\binom{x}{1} + a_2\binom{x}{2} + \cdots + a_{2r}\binom{x}{2r} = f(x) - c,$$

since the polynomial in the right hand side has constant term equal to 0.

Next we show that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{2r} a_j \sum_{H \in \mathbb{P}_{i+j}(X), I \subset H} L_H = -cL_I. \tag{4}$$

In fact both sides are linear forms in x_A, for $A \in \mathcal{A}$. The coefficient of x_A in the left hand side is $\sum_{j=1}^{2r} a_j |\{H | I \subset H \subset A, n \notin H, |H| = i+j\}|$. So it is equal to

$$\begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } I \not\subset A; \\ a_1\binom{|A|-i}{1} + a_2\binom{|A|-i}{2} + \cdots + a_{2r}\binom{|A|-i}{2r}, & \text{if } I \subset A \text{ and } n \notin A; \\ a_1\binom{|A|-i-1}{1} + a_2\binom{|A|-i-1}{2} + \cdots + a_{2r}\binom{|A|-i-1}{2r}, & \text{if } I \subset A \text{ and } n \in A. \end{cases}$$

By the above polynomial identity,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{2r} a_j \binom{|A|-i}{j} = f(|A|-i) - c = -c \ \text{ since } |A| \pmod p \in K;$$

$$\sum_{j=1}^{2r} a_j \binom{|A|-i-1}{j} = f(|A|-i-1) - c = -c \ \text{ since } |A| \pmod p \in K.$$

The coefficient of x_A in the right hand side is obviously the same. This proves (4).

Writing (4) in a different way, we have

$$\sum_{H\in\mathbb{P}_{i+2r}(X),I\subset H} L_H = -\frac{1}{(2r)!}(cL_I + \sum_{j=1}^{2r-1} a_j \sum_{H\in\mathbb{P}_{i+j}(X),I\subset H} L_H).$$

This proves the lemma in case (a).

(b) $i \pmod p \in K$ or $i+1 \pmod p \in K$ for some i. In this case, the constant term of $(x-(k_1-i))(x-(k_2-i))\cdots(x-(k_r-i))(x-(k_1-i-1))\cdots(x-(k_r-i-1))$ is $0 \in \mathbb{F}_p$. So there exists $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_{2r-1} \in \mathbb{F}_p$, $a_{2r} = (2r)! \in \mathbb{F}_p - \{0\}$ such that

$$a_1\binom{x}{1} + a_2\binom{x}{2} + \cdots + a_{2r}\binom{x}{2r} = f(x)$$

As a consequence we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^{2r} a_j \sum_{H\in\mathbb{P}_{i+j}(X),I\subset H} L_H = 0 \quad \forall I \in \mathbb{P}_i(X),$$

i.e. we have

$$\sum_{H\in\mathbb{P}_{i+2r}(X),I\subset H} L_H = -\frac{1}{(2r)!}(\sum_{j=1}^{2r-1} a_j \sum_{H\in\mathbb{P}_{i+j}(X),I\subset H} L_H).$$

This finishes the proof of this lemma.

□

Corollary 2.3. *With the same condition as in Lemma 2.2, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}&\langle L_H : H \in \cup_{j=i}^{i+2r-1}\mathbb{P}_j(X)\rangle \\ &= \left\langle L_H : H \in \cup_{j=i}^{i+2r-1}\mathbb{P}_j(X)\right\rangle + \left\langle \sum_{H\in\mathbb{P}_{i+2r}(X),I\subset H} L_H : I \in \mathbb{P}_i(X)\right\rangle\end{aligned}$$

Here $\langle L_H : H \in \cup_{j=i}^{i+2r-1}\mathbb{P}_j(X)\rangle$ is the vector space spanned by $\{L_H : H \in \cup_{j=i}^{i+2r-1}\mathbb{P}_j(X)\}$.

The rest of the proof is similar to the proof of Theorem 1.9 given by Qian and Ray-Chaudhuri [10]. The next lemma is a restatement of [10, Lemma 2], and is used to prove Lemma 2.5.

Lemma 2.4. *For any positive integers u, v with $u < v < p$ and $u + v \le n-1$, we have*

$$\dim\left(\frac{\langle L_J : J \in \mathbb{P}_v(X)\rangle}{\langle \sum_{J\in\mathbb{P}_v(X),I\subset J} L_J : I \in \mathbb{P}_u(X)\rangle}\right) \le \binom{n-1}{v} - \binom{n-1}{u}.$$

Here $\frac{A}{B}$ is the quotient space of two vector spaces A and B with $B \le A$.

Lemma 2.5. *For any $i \in \{0, 1, \ldots, s-2r+1\}$,*

$$\begin{aligned}&\binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{i+1} + \cdots + \binom{n-1}{i+2r-1} + \dim\left(\frac{\langle L_H : H \in \cup_{j=i}^{s}\mathbb{P}_j(X)\rangle}{\langle L_H : H \in \cup_{j=i}^{i+2r-1}\mathbb{P}_j(X)\rangle}\right) \\ &\le \binom{n-1}{s-2r+1} + \binom{n-1}{s-2r+2} + \cdots + \binom{n-1}{s}.\end{aligned}$$

Proof. We induct on $s-2r+1-i$. It is clearly true when $s-2r+1-i=0$. Suppose the lemma holds for $s-2r+1-i<l$ for some positive integer l. Now we want to show that it holds for $s-2r+1-i=l$.

We observe that $i+i+2r \le (s-2r)+(s-2r)+2r \le n-1$ by the condition in the theorem. By Corollary 2.3 and Lemma 2.4, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\dim\left(\frac{\langle L_H : H \in \cup_{j=i}^{i+2r}\mathbb{P}_j(X)\rangle}{\langle L_H : H \in \cup_{j=i}^{i+2r-1}\mathbb{P}_j(X)\rangle}\right)\\
&= \dim\left(\frac{\langle L_H : H \in \cup_{j=i}^{i+2r-1}\mathbb{P}_j(X)\rangle + \langle L_H : H \in \mathbb{P}_{i+2r}(X)\rangle}{\langle L_H : H \in \cup_{j=i}^{i+2r-1}\mathbb{P}_j(X)\rangle + \langle \sum_{H\in\mathbb{P}_{i+2r}(X), I\subset H} L_H : I \in \mathbb{P}_i(X)\rangle}\right)\\
&\le \dim\left(\frac{L_H : H \in \mathbb{P}_{i+2r}(X)}{\sum_{H\in\mathbb{P}_{i+2r}(X), I\subset H} L_H : I \in \mathbb{P}_i(X)}\right)\\
&\le \binom{n-1}{i+2r} - \binom{n-1}{i}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now we are ready to prove the lemma.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{i+1} + \cdots + \binom{n-1}{i+2r-1} + \dim\left(\frac{\langle L_H : H \in \cup_{j=i}^{s}\mathbb{P}_j(X)\rangle}{\langle L_H : H \in \cup_{j=i}^{i+2r-1}\mathbb{P}_j(X)\rangle}\right)\\
&= \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{i+1} + \cdots + \binom{n-1}{i+2r-1} + \dim\left(\frac{\langle L_H : H \in \cup_{j=i}^{i+2r}\mathbb{P}_j(X)\rangle}{\langle L_H : H \in \cup_{j=i}^{i+2r-1}\mathbb{P}_j(X)\rangle}\right)\\
&\quad + \dim\left(\frac{\langle L_H : H \in \cup_{j=i}^{s}\mathbb{P}_j(X)\rangle}{\langle L_H : H \in \cup_{j=i}^{i+2r}\mathbb{P}_j(X)\rangle}\right)\\
&= \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{i+1} + \cdots + \binom{n-1}{i+2r-1} + \dim\left(\frac{\langle L_H : H \in \cup_{j=i}^{i+2r}\mathbb{P}_j(X)\rangle}{\langle L_H : H \in \cup_{j=i}^{i+2r-1}\mathbb{P}_j(X)\rangle}\right)\\
&\quad + \dim\left(\frac{\langle L_H : H \in \mathbb{P}_i(X)\rangle + \langle L_H : H \in \cup_{j=i+1}^{s}\mathbb{P}_j(X)\rangle}{\langle L_H : H \in \mathbb{P}_i(X)\rangle + \langle L_H : H \in \cup_{j=i+1}^{i+2r}\mathbb{P}_j(X)\rangle}\right)\\
&\le \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{i+1} + \cdots + \binom{n-1}{i+2r-1} + \dim\left(\frac{\langle L_H : H \in \cup_{j=i}^{i+2r}\mathbb{P}_j(X)\rangle}{\langle L_H : H \in \cup_{j=i}^{i+2r-1}\mathbb{P}_j(X)\rangle}\right)\\
&\quad + \dim\left(\frac{\langle L_H : H \in \cup_{j=i+1}^{s}\mathbb{P}_j(X)\rangle}{\langle L_H : H \in \cup_{j=i+1}^{i+2r}\mathbb{P}_j(X)\rangle}\right)\\
&\le \binom{n-1}{i} + \binom{n-1}{i+1} + \cdots + \binom{n-1}{i+2r-1} + \binom{n-1}{i+2r} - \binom{n-1}{i}\\
&\quad + \dim\left(\frac{\langle L_H : H \in \cup_{j=i+1}^{s}\mathbb{P}_j(X)\rangle}{\langle L_H : H \in \cup_{j=i+1}^{i+2r}\mathbb{P}_j(X)\rangle}\right)\\
&= \binom{n-1}{i+1} + \cdots + \binom{n}{i+2r} + \dim\left(\frac{\langle L_H : H \in \cup_{j=i+1}^{s}\mathbb{P}_j(X)\rangle}{\langle L_H : H \in \cup_{j=i+1}^{i+2r}\mathbb{P}_j(X)\rangle}\right)\\
&\le \binom{n-1}{s-2r+1} + \cdots + \binom{n-1}{s},
\end{aligned}$$

where the last step follows from the induction hypothesis since $s-2r+1-(i+1)<l$. ∎

We are now turning to the proof of Theorem 1.15.

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathcal{A}| \leq & \dim(\langle L_H : H \in \cup_{i=0}^{s}\mathbb{P}_i(X)\rangle) \\
\leq & \dim(\langle L_H : H \in \cup_{i=0}^{2r-1}\mathbb{P}_i(X)\rangle) + \dim\left(\frac{\langle L_H : H \in \cup_{i=0}^{s}\mathbb{P}_j(X)\rangle}{\langle L_H : H \in \cup_{i=0}^{2r-1}\mathbb{P}_j(X)\rangle}\right) \\
\leq & \binom{n-1}{0} + \binom{n-1}{1} + \cdots + \binom{n-1}{2r-1} + \dim\left(\frac{\langle L_H : H \in \cup_{i=0}^{s}\mathbb{P}_j(X)\rangle}{\langle L_H : H \in \cup_{i=0}^{2r-1}\mathbb{P}_j(X)\rangle}\right) \\
\leq & \binom{n-1}{s-2r+1} + \binom{n-1}{s-2r+2} + \cdots + \binom{n-1}{s} \text{ by taking } i=0 \text{ in Lemma 2.5,}
\end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof of the theorem. □

3 Proof of Theorem 1.14

Throughout this section, we let p be a prime and we will use $x = (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n)$ to denote a vector of n variables with each variable x_i taking values 0 or 1. A polynomial $f(x)$ in n variables x_i, for $1 \leq i \leq n$, is called *multilinear* if the power of each variable x_i in each term is at most one. Clearly, if each variable x_i only takes the values 0 or 1, then any polynomial in variable x can be regarded as multilinear. For a subset A of $[n]$, we define the incidence vector v_A of A to be the vector $v = (v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n)$ with $v_i = 1$ if $i \in A$ and $v_i = 0$ otherwise.

Let $L = \{l_1, l_2, \ldots, l_s\}$ and $K = \{k_1, k_2, \ldots, k_r\}$ be two disjoint subsets of $\{0, 1, \ldots, p-1\}$, where the elements of K are arranged in increasing order. Suppose that $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, \ldots, A_m\}$ is the family of subsets of $[n]$ satisfying the conditions in Theorem 1.14. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $n \in A_j$ for $j \geq t+1$ and $n \notin A_j$ for $1 \leq j \leq t$.

For each $A_j \in \mathcal{A}$, define

$$f_{A_j}(x) = \prod_{i=1}^{s}(v_{A_j}x - l_i),$$

where $x = (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n)$ is a vector of n variables with each variable x_i taking values 0 or 1. Then each $f_{A_j}(x)$ is a multilinear polynomial of degree at most s.

Let Q be the family of subsets of $[n-1]$ with sizes at most $s-1$. Then $|Q| = \sum_{i=0}^{s-1}\binom{n-1}{i}$. For each $L \in Q$, define

$$q_L(x) = (1 - x_n)\prod_{i \in L} x_i.$$

Then each $q_L(x)$ is a multilinear polynomial of degree at most s.

Denote $K - 1 = \{k_i - 1 | k_i \in K\}$. Then $|K \cup (K-1)| \leq 2r$. Set

$$g(x) = \prod_{h \in K \cup (K-1)}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} x_i - h\right).$$

Let W be the family of subsets of $[n-1]$ with sizes at most $s-2r$. Then $|W| = \sum_{i=0}^{s-2r}\binom{n-1}{i}$. For each $I \in W$, define

$$g_I(x) = g(x)\prod_{i \in I} x_i.$$

Then each $g_I(x)$ is a multilinear polynomial of degree at most s.

We want to show that the polynomials in

$$\{f_{A_i(x)}|1 \le i \le m\} \cup \{q_L(x)|L \in Q\} \cup \{g_I(x)|I \in W\}$$

are linearly independent over the field $\mathbb{F}_p$. Suppose that we have a linear combination of these polynomials that equals 0:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} a_i f_{A_i}(x) + \sum_{L \in Q} b_L q_L(x) + \sum_{I \in W} u_I g_I(x) = 0, \tag{5}$$

with all coefficients a_i, b_L and u_I being in $\mathbb{F}_p$.

Claim 1. $a_i = 0$ for each i with $n \in A_i$.

Suppose, to the contrary, that i_0 is a subscript such that $n \in A_{i_0}$ and $a_{i_0} \neq 0$. Since $n \in A_{i_0}$, $q_L(v_{A_{i_0}}) = 0$ for every $L \in Q$. Recall that $f_{A_j}(v_{i_0}) = 0$ for $j \neq i_0$ and $g(v_{i_0}) = 0$. By evaluating (5) with $x = v_{A_{i_0}}$, we obtain that $a_{i_0} f_{A_{i_0}}(v_{A_{i_0}}) = 0 \pmod p$. Since $f_{A_{i_0}}(v_{A_{i_0}}) \neq 0$, we have $a_{i_0} = 0$, a contradiction. Thus, Claim 1 holds.

Claim 2. $a_i = 0$ for each i with $n \notin A_i$. Applying Claim 1, we get

$$\sum_{i=1}^{t} a_i f_{A_i}(x) + \sum_{L \in Q} b_L q_L(x) + \sum_{I \in W} u_I g_I(x) = 0. \tag{6}$$

Suppose, to the contrary, that i_0 is a subscript such that $n \notin A_{i_0}$ and $a_{i_0} \neq 0$. Let $v'_{i_0} = v_{i_0} + (0, 0, \ldots, 0, 1)$. Then $q_L(v'_{i_0}) = 0$ for every $L \in Q$. Note that $f_{A_j}(v'_{i_0}) = f_{A_j}(v_{i_0})$ for each j with $n \notin A_j$ and $g(v'_{i_0}) = 0$. By evaluating (6) with $x = v'_{i_0}$, we obtain $a_{i_0} f_{A_{i_0}}(v'_{i_0}) = a_{i_0} f_{A_{i_0}}(v_{i_0}) = 0 \pmod p$ which implies $a_{i_0} = 0$, a contradiction. Thus, the claim is verified.

Claim 3. $b_L = 0$ for each $L \in Q$.

By Claims 1 and 2, we obtain

$$\sum_{L \in Q} b_L q_L(x) + \sum_{I \in W} u_I g_I(x) = 0. \tag{7}$$

Set $x_n = 0$ in (7), then

$$\sum_{L \in Q} b_L \prod_{i \in L} x_i + \sum_{I \in W} u_I g_I(x) = 0.$$

Subtracting the above equality from (7), we get

$$\sum_{L \in Q} b_L \left(x_n \prod_{i \in L} x_i \right) = 0.$$

Setting $x_n = 1$, we obtain

$$\sum_{L \in Q} b_L \prod_{i \in L} x_i = 0.$$

It is not difficult to see that the polynomials $\prod_{i \in L} x_i$, $L \in Q$, are linearly independent. Therefore, we conclude that $b_L = 0$ for each $L \in Q$.

By Claims 1-3, we now have

$$\sum_{I \in W} u_I g_I(x) = 0.$$

Thus it is sufficient to prove g_I's are linearly independent.

Let N be a positive integer and $H = \{h_1, h_2, \ldots, h_u\}$ be a subset of $[N]$ with all the elements being arranged in increasing order. We say H *has a gap* of size $\geq g$ if either $h_1 \geq g-1, N-h_u \geq g-1$, or $h_{i+1} - h_i \geq g$ for some i $(1 \leq i \leq u-1)$. The following result obtained by Alon, Babai and Suzuki [1] is critical to our proof.

Lemma 3.1. *Let H be a subset of $\{0, 1, \ldots, p-1\}$. Let $p(x)$ denote the polynomial function defined by $p(x) = \prod_{h\in H}(x_1 + x_2 + \cdots + x_N - h)$. If the set $(H + p\mathbb{Z}) \cap [N]$ has a gap $\geq g+1$, where g is a positive integer, then the set of polynomials $\{p_I(x) : |I| \leq g-1, I \in N\}$ is linearly independent over $\mathbb{F}_p$, where $p_I(x) = p(x)\prod_{i\in I} x_i$.*

To apply Lemma 3.1, we define the set H as follows: $H = (K \cup (K-1) + p\mathbb{Z}) \cap [n-1]$. We can divide $n-1$ into the the following four cases:

1. $s + k_r - 1 \leq n - 1 < p + k_1 - 1$;
2. $s + k_r - 1 < p + k_1 - 1 \leq n - 1$;
3. $(s - 2r + 1) + k_r < p + k_1 - 1 \leq s + k_r - 1 \leq n - 1$;
4. $p + k_1 - 1 \leq (s - 2r + 1) + k_r \leq s + k_r - 1 \leq n - 1$.

Case 1: $s + k_r - 1 \leq n - 1 < p + k_1 - 1$.

Since $n-1 < p+k_1-1$, the set H consists of only $\{k_1-1, k_1, \ldots, k_r\}$. From $s+k_r-1 \leq n-1$, we obtain $n-1-k_r \geq s-1 \geq s-2r+1$. By the definition of the gap, H has a gap $\geq s-2r+2$.

Case 2: $s + k_r - 1 < p + k_1 - 1 \leq n - 1$.

Since $n-1 \geq p+k_1-1$, the set H contains at least the following elements $\{k_1-1, k_1, \ldots, k_r, p+k_1-1\}$. From $s + k_r - 1 < p + k_1 - 1$, we derive $(p + k_1 - 1) - k_r \geq s \geq s - 2r + 2$. Thus, H has a gap $\geq s - 2r + 2$.

Case 3: $(s - 2r + 1) + k_r < p + k_1 - 1 \leq s + k_r - 1 \leq n - 1$.

Since $n-1 \geq p+k_1-1$, H contains at least the following elements $\{k_1-1, k_1, \ldots, k_r, p+k_1-1\}$. Since $(s - 2r + 1) + k_r < p + k_1 - 1$, we have $(p + k_1 - 1) - k_r > s - 2r + 1$. Then H has a gap $\geq s - 2r + 2$.

By applying Lemma 3.1, we conclude that the set of polynomials $\{g_I(x) : I \in W\}$ is linearly independent over $\mathbb{F}_p$, and so $u_I = 0$ for each $I \in W$.

In summary, for the Cases 1–3, we have shown that the polynomials in

$$\{f_{A_i(x)} | 1 \leq i \leq m\} \cup \{q_L(x) | L \in Q\} \cup \{g_I(x) | I \in W\}$$

are linearly independent over the field $\mathbb{F}_p$. Since the set of all monomials in variables $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n$ of degree at most s forms a basis for the vector space of multilinear polynomials of degree at most s, it follows that

$$|\mathcal{A}| + \sum_{i=0}^{s-1} \binom{n-1}{i} + \sum_{i=0}^{s-2r} \binom{n-1}{i} \leq \sum_{i=0}^{s} \binom{n}{i},$$

which implies that

$$|\mathcal{A}| \leq \binom{n-1}{s} + \binom{n-1}{s-1} + \cdots + \binom{n-1}{s-2r+1}.$$

This completes the proof of the theorem for the Cases 1–3.

Since Theorem 1.15 has shown that the statement of Theorem 1.14 remains true under the condition $n \geq 2s-2r+1$, we just consider $n \leq 2s-2r$ for the Case 4. The following argument is similar to the technique Hwang and Kim used for the proof of Alon-Babai-Suzuki's conjecture.

Since $p+k_1-1 \le (s-2r+1)+k_r \le s+k_r-1 \le n-1 \le 2s-2r-1$, we obtain $k_r \le s-2r$. Thus, we have $r+s \le p \le s-2r+2+k_r-k_1 \le 2s-4r+1$. This implies $s \ge 5r-1$. Since $n \le 2s-2r < 2p$, we have $|A_i| \in (K+p\mathbb{Z}) \cap [n] = \{k_1, k_2, \ldots, k_r, p+k_1, \ldots, p+k_c\}$ for some $1 \le c \le r$. This gives

$$|\mathcal{A}| \le \binom{n}{k_1} + \binom{n}{k_2} + \cdots + \binom{n}{k_r} + \binom{n}{p+k_1} + \cdots + \binom{n}{p+k_c}.$$

We will show that the right hand side of the above inequality is less than or equal to $\binom{n-1}{s} + \binom{n-1}{s-1} + \ldots + \binom{n-1}{s-2r+1} = \binom{n}{s} + \binom{n}{s-2} + \ldots + \binom{n}{s-2r+2}$. Since $s+r+k_1-1 \le p+k_1-1 \le (s-2r+1)+k_r$, we have $k_r \ge 3r-2+k_1$. Let $n = 2s-2r-\delta$ for integer δ, where $0 \le \delta \le s-5r+1$, since $2s-2r \ge n \ge s+k_r \ge s+3r-2+k_1$. Since the sequence $\{\binom{n}{k}\}$ is unimodal and symmetric around $n/2$, we have $|s-n/2| = r+\delta/2 > r-\delta/2-2 = |n/2-(s-2r+2)|$.

Therefore we have

$$\min\left[\binom{n}{s}, \binom{n}{s-2}, \ldots, \binom{n}{s-2r+2}\right] = \binom{n}{s}. \tag{8}$$

Since $n = 2s-2r-\delta \ge p+k_c \ge r+s+k_c$, we have $k_c \le s-3r-\delta$. For $1 \le i \le c$, k_i can be written as $k_i = s-3r-\delta-a_i$, where $0 < a_i \le s-3r-\delta$. Thus, we have $p+k_i \ge r+s+k_i = 2s-2r-\delta-a_i$ where $1 \le i \le c$. Since $2s-2r-\delta-a_i \ge s+r > n/2$, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{c}\left(\binom{n}{k_i} + \binom{n}{p+k_i}\right) \le \sum_{i=1}^{c}\left(\binom{n}{s-3r-\delta-a_i} + \binom{n}{2s-2r-\delta-a_i}\right).$$

For $c+1 \le i \le r$, we derive $k_i \le k_r < s-2r-\delta < n/2$. Noting that $|s-n/2| = r+\delta/2 = |n/2-(s-2r-\delta)|$, we have $\binom{n}{k_i} \le \binom{n}{s}$ for all $c+1 \le i \le r$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}|\mathcal{A}| &\le \sum_{i=1}^{c}\left(\binom{n}{k_i} + \binom{n}{p+k_i}\right) + \sum_{i=c+1}^{r}\binom{n}{k_i} \\ &\le \sum_{i=1}^{c}\left(\binom{n}{s-3r-\delta-a_i} + \binom{n}{2s-2r-\delta-a_i}\right) + (r-c)\binom{n}{s}.\end{aligned}$$

With the help of the next lemma, we can complete our proof.

Lemma 3.2. [8] *For all $0 \le c < k \le n/2$, we have*

$$\binom{n}{k-1-c} + \binom{n}{c} \le \binom{n}{k}.$$

Let $k = n-s = s-2r-\delta < n/2$, apply Lemma 3.2. For every $0 \le a \le s-3r-\delta < k$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\binom{n}{s-3r-\delta-a} + \binom{n}{2s-2r-\delta-a} \\ &\quad= \binom{n}{n-s-r-a} + \binom{n}{n-a} \\ &\quad= \binom{n}{k-r-a} + \binom{n}{a} \\ &\quad\le \binom{n}{k-1-a} + \binom{n}{a} \\ &\quad\le \binom{n}{k} = \binom{n}{s}.\end{aligned}$$

We now finish the proof of Theorem 1.14 for the Case 4.

$$|\mathcal{A}| \le \sum_{i=1}^{c} \left(\binom{n}{s-3r-\delta-a_i} + \binom{n}{2s-2r-\delta-a_i} \right) + (r-c)\binom{n}{s} \le r\binom{n}{s}.$$

By (8), we have

$$|\mathcal{A}| \le \binom{n}{s} + \binom{n}{s-2} + \cdots + \binom{n}{s-2r+2} = \binom{n-1}{s} + \binom{n-1}{s-1} + \cdots + \binom{n-1}{s-2r+1}.$$

Acknowledgements

The research of G. Ge was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant Nos. 61171198, 11431003 and 61571310, and the Importation and Development of High-Caliber Talents Project of Beijing Municipal Institutions.

References

[1] N. Alon, L. Babai, and H. Suzuki. Multilinear polynomials and Frankl–Ray-Chaudhuri–Wilson type intersection theorems. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 58(2):165–180, 1991.

[2] R. C. Bose. A note on Fisher's inequality for balanced incomplete block designs. *Ann. Math. Statistics*, 20:619–620, 1949.

[3] W. Y. C. Chen and J. Liu. Set systems with L-intersections modulo a prime number. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 116(1):120–131, 2009.

[4] N. G. de Bruijn and P. Erdös. On a combinatorial problem. *Nederl. Akad. Wetensch., Proc.*, 51:1277–1279 = Indagationes Math. 10, 421–423 (1948), 1948.

[5] P. Erdős, C. Ko, and R. Rado. Intersection theorems for systems of finite sets. *Quart. J. Math. Oxford Ser. (2)*, 12:313–320, 1961.

[6] P. Frankl and R. M. Wilson. Intersection theorems with geometric consequences. *Combinatorica*, 1(4):357–368, 1981.

[7] V. Grolmusz and B. Sudakov. On k-wise set-intersections and k-wise Hamming-distances. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 99(1):180–190, 2002.

[8] K.-W. Hwang and Y. Kim. A proof of Alon-Babai-Suzuki's conjecture and multilinear polynomials. *European J. Combin.*, 43:289–294, 2015.

[9] J. Liu and W. Yang. Set systems with restricted k-wise L-intersections modulo a prime number. *European J. Combin.*, 36:707–719, 2014.

[10] J. Qian and D. K. Ray-Chaudhuri. On mod-p Alon-Babai-Suzuki inequality. *J. Algebraic Combin.*, 12(1):85–93, 2000.

[11] D. K. Ray-Chaudhuri and R. M. Wilson. On t-designs. *Osaka J. Math.*, 12(3):737–744, 1975.

[12] H. S. Snevily. On generalizations of the de Bruijn-Erdős theorem. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 68(1):232–238, 1994.